

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-55 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-55 are cancelled herein.

Claims 56-80 are added herein.

Therefore, claims 56-80 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-55 were previously rejected.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-8, claims 1-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Lin. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 56, for example, recites "a plurality of data servers ... configured to store information and to push-transmit update information related to updating of the information to the at least one agent ... the push-transmit being responsive to the information having been updated in the data server". In other words, data servers notify the agent when updates occur. The agent "transmit[s] via the network the update information to one or more of the user terminals if the update information relates to information that has been registered in the at least one agent as being requested by the one or more of the user terminals". In other words, the agent notifies the relevant registered terminals of the updates. Finally, "the one or more of the user terminals are configured to receive the update information transmitted from the at least one agent and to obtain the information updated."

The rejection cites Johnson as providing the recited data servers and agent. As the rejection states, "server requests are originated by client computers". Furthermore, Johnson describes itself as "a system and method of routing requests received from client computers"

(Abstract, first sentence). According to claim 56, requests are not originated by client computers, but rather update information dissemination is initiated (push-transmitted) from data servers responsive to updates of the servers' information. The last element of claim 56 shows that a client may obtain the updated information after being notified by the agent. As seen in claim 57, after being notified, a client can "obtain" the updated information by issuing a client request that is perhaps ordinary and comparable to client requests in Johnson (Johnson's client requests are not related to corresponding prior update notification). See claim 57.

The rejection also cites Lin. However, like Johnson, Lin relates to a system where clients pull information without regard to receiving notice of an update from an agent. The servers in Lin do not transmit to the caches when updates occur, but rather they broadcasts all of the files needed by the cache servers to service client requests. Furthermore, Lin's cache servers service client requests rather than send *update* information clients. Both Johnson and Lin are silent regarding the sequence of an update to server information causing the server to notify an agent which then determines whether to notify clients (the clients then obtaining the updated information). Although some of the present dependent claims recite the agent also sending the actually updated information to clients, the agent first notifies the client of the update, and the agent only receives the needed (updated) information, rather than all information needed to respond to client requests.

Claim 70 recites "registering information about a user terminal connected to a network using an Internet protocol and information requested by the user terminal into an agent which is connected to the network ... push-transmitting [to the agent], from a data server ... update information related to updating of the data server's information responsive to detection of the information having been updated in the data server [and] transmitting from the agent the update information to the user terminal via the network if the update information has been requested as indicated by the registering of information about the user terminal".

Claim 80 recites "receiving over the network at the intermediary agent registrations from clients, the registrations indicating different types of information of interest to different clients, whereby a client registers with the intermediary agent its respective information type". In other words, a client registers its interest with the agent. Claim 80 then recites "the update notices are pushed [to the agent] from the information servers responsive to such servers having detected

that their served information has been updated, and where the update notices indicate respective types of information updated at the information servers". And, "receiving the update notices at the intermediary agent and using the update notices and the prior registrations to determine which clients are to be notified of which information server updates".

Allowance of claims 57-80 is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 73 recites "when the agent is notified by a data server not registered in the table that the information is going to be provided from the data server the agent registers the data server into the table". This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Although some similarities exist between the new claims and the previous claims, the new claims are intended to clarify the invention, consolidate redundant claims, and recite independent claims with combinations of features with some similarity to previous dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12 April 2004

By: James T. Strom
James T. Strom
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 12, 2004.
STAAS & HALSEY
By: James T. Strom
Date: April 12, 2004